

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-25 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 14 and 25 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14 and 15 are amended. Claims 21-25 are added. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action dated April 18, 2006, claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-15, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Burgoon, U.S. Patent No. 5,706,510 in view of Gilmour, U.S. Patent No. 6,647,384. Claims 4 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Burgoon in view of Gilmour and further in view of Poynor, U.S. Patent No. 6,859,812. Claims 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Burgoon in view of Gilmour and further in view of Kawaguchi, U.S. Patent No. 5,832,527. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-15, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Burgoon in view of Hendricks et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,313,646. Claims 4 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(as) being allegedly unpatentable over Burgoon in view of Hendricks et al. and further in view of Poynor. Claims 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Burgoon in view of Hendricks and further in view of Kawaguchi.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Interview at the USPTO of May 30, 2006

Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the in person interview at the USPTO. During the interview, rejections based on Burgoon were

discussed. Applicants proposed amendments to the independent claims that would overcome the Burgoon reference, and the Examiner indicated that favorable consideration would be given to such an amendment. The independent claims have been amended, as proposed during the interview. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims in their present form distinguish over Burgoon, or Burgoon in combination with other references. Applicants also submit that the proposed amendment distinguishes over any storage scheme where shared files are stored in some altered form and require client-side software for accessing files, such as those taught in Burgoon or Burgoon in combination with other references. Furthermore, the client-side software in conventional systems extracts the entire file from the storage for further handling by the client. On the contrary, the invention as claimed in claim 1 provides direct access to files by using shareable and user file trees and properties of file trees.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

As noted earlier, the independent claims have been amended to further clarify that one user cannot see a path to a file stored in the private file area of another user. This is in contrast to the references cited in the Office Action. For example, in Gilmour, as discussed in the interview, a user is, in fact, able to see the file path to the files of another user – the only question is whether he can access them or not. The combination recited in the present claims makes it impossible for one user to even be aware that there is a path to files of another user.

Other claims have been amended to address minor stylistic issues, to ensure that there is proper antecedent basis everywhere, etc.

Reconsideration and an allowance of all the claims is therefore respectfully requested.

New Claims 21-25

New claims 21-25 have been added. These claims are directed to such aspect as the maintenance of only a single version of a file (see last clause of the claim). This is clearly in contrast to, for example, the versioning system of Burgoon, where multiple file versions are maintained, by definition.

Also, the added claims recite the aspect of the links to the files themselves being files. This, again, is in contrast to Burgoon, which uses a table of links – not files that themselves are links.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BARDMESSER LAW GROUP

/GB/

George S. Bardmesser
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,020

Date: June 22, 2006

910 17th Street, N.W.
Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 293-1191